

University of Groningen

## Notiunculae Martyrologicae II

Boeft, Jan den; Bremmer, Jan

*Published in:*  
Vigilae Christianae

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
1982

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Boeft, J. D., & Bremmer, J. (1982). Notiunculae Martyrologicae II. *Vigilae Christianae*, 36, 383-402.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

## NOTIUNCULAE MARTYROLOGICAE II

BY

JAN DEN BOEFT AND JAN BREMMER

The small collection of notes on some of the *Acta Martyrum*, published in this journal (*Vig. Chr.* 35, 1981, 43-56) has received the kind attention of scholars. This has encouraged us to present a second series of *notiunculae*, in which other passages are dealt with.<sup>1</sup> We follow the order of Musurillo's edition.

Martyrium Carpi 17. In the paragraphs 9-20 of the Greek version of these *Acta Carpi* in answer to the proconsul's invitation to offer sacrifice to the gods polemically expounds a condensed version of a full-scale Christian theory about the pagan gods. The Latin recension only has the equivalent of some statements at the beginning of the Greek passage in question. It indeed seems rather unlikely that a Roman governor would have allowed any extensive exposition of ideas so insulting to official Roman religion.<sup>2</sup> Be that as it may, a thorough examination of the exposition as such might provide a clue as to the date of the Greek document, without of course proving anything about the time of the passion itself.

For the moment, however, we confine ourselves to one remarkable detail. Carpi calls the gods νεκροί (11) and mere ὕλη (15). But in spite of that in par. 17 he takes the possibility of their prophesying quite seriously: τὸ 62 χρησμεύειν καὶ ἀπατᾶν αὐτοὺς μὴ θαυμάσης. One should also mark the plural αὐτοὺς in this phrase, for in the very next sentence he turns to the singular: ὁ γὰρ διάβολος ....ἀνταγωνίζεται, and this is continued until the end. Obviously the devil, ὁ διάβολος, is considered to be the real force present in such prophecies. It is not stated, however, by which methods he is exerting his influence. Possibly in the theory which is recapitulated, he is held to be the leader or prince of evil spirits which make use of the dead idols purported to be gods by the pagans (cf. Tertullian's ideas in *De idololatria*, explained very recently in this journal by J. C. M. van Winden: *Idolum* and *Zdololatria* in Tertullian (*Vig. Chr.* 36, 1982,

108-114). But apart from τοῖς ἰδίοις (17), the precise meaning of which is difficult to ascertain, nothing points to a plurality of evil spirits. There could be a wholly different solution, as the following passage may show: *quidquid enim iniquitatum homines gerunt, a diabolo suggeritur: quem nunc sub singulari numero demonstrat, cum superius sub plurali ministeria eius significasset in plurimis* (Hilarius, *Tract. in CXL Psalmum* 16). In this text *diabolus* does not signify the prince of wicked demons, the word is rather used as a collective singular. Thus the late P. G. van der Nat, referring to the text just quoted, in his contribution to the lemma *Geister* in *RAC* 9; a similar explanation is presented by van der Nat in his note on Tertullian, *De idol.* 5.6: "... Tertullian uses the term 'the devil' as a collective singular". Earlier the same idea had been expounded concerning Tertullian, *De anima* 57.5 by J. H. Waszink: "les mots *spiritus nequam* ne désignent pas un seul démon, mais le diable, 'singulier collectif' de *daemon*" (*Vig. Chr.* 1, 1947, 22= *Opuscula Selecta* 297). In any case, either as a normal or as a collective singular, the 'devil' is said to be responsible for the prophecies etc. of the so-called gods.

*Martyrium Carpi* 24. In his important study of the chronology and authenticity of the pre-Decian *Acta Martyrum* T. D. Barnes finally with some hesitation ascribes these *Acta* to the Decian persecution.<sup>3</sup> His investigation did not enable him to reach a firm conclusion but he could at least point to one hitherto neglected indication. The proconsul asked Papyrus about his rank: ὁ ἀνθύπατος ἐπὶ τὸν Παπύλον ἐτρέπετο λέγων αὐτῷ· βουλευτῆς εἶ; (24). The Latin version runs as follows: *et dixit ad eum: principalis es? (3.1)*. Since the earliest reference to *principalis* as a legal category occurs in Callistratus (*Dig.* 48.19.27), who lived under Septimius Severus and Caracalla, this mention at least gives some sort of *terminus post quem*. Also the implication of the proconsul's question, viz. that *principales* had certain legal prerogatives, points to the third century rather than to the second.<sup>4</sup>

We can, however, also establish a *terminus ante quem*. The process of Papyrus and his fellow martyrs took place in Pergamum. We know from Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 5.126) that Pergamum was one of the assize centers of the Roman province of Asia, where the proconsul every year administered justice: *Pergamena uocatur eius tractus iurisdictio. ad eam conueniunt Thyatireni, Massipii, ... Hermocopelitae, Attalenses, Panteenses, Apollonienses aliaeque inhonorate ciuitates*.<sup>5</sup> Now Papyrus

came from Thyatira (Greek version par. 27) and, as Pliny informs us, this city belonged to the *conuentus iuridicus* of Pergamum. Papyrus' citizenship thus fits in exactly with what we know about the Roman administration of justice.<sup>6</sup> But we know that the emperor Caracalla granted to Thyatira the right to hold assizes after he had stayed there in 215.<sup>7</sup> So after 215 an inhabitant of Thyatira, and certainly a proper citizen as Papyrus was (Greek version par. 24), would have been tried in the city itself and no longer at Pergamum. We suggest therefore that the trial of Papyrus took place before 215, possibly during a persecution in the reign of Septimius Severus.

*Martyrium Carpi* 47: καὶ οὕτως ἀπέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐτελειώθη σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις. At the end of the martyrdom of Carpus and Papyrus the Greek version reports a most curious incident. A woman, named Agathonice, experiences the glorious passion of the two martyrs as a call from heaven inviting her to the heavenly ἄριστον (cf. *Matth.* 22.4). Without delay she makes herself available to be executed and indeed the execution takes place immediately: Agathonice dies at the stake. One cannot very well imagine the authorities agreeing to such a course of things.<sup>8</sup> The Latin version, published by Franchi de' Cavalieri, presents a much more normal version of Agathonice's passion with a trial in front of the proconsul, the latter's urge to offer sacrifice and a formal condemnation. It seems likely that the Greek version is an adaptation, possibly, as von Harnack and Franchi de' Cavalieri have suggested in view of the Phrygian 'Martyrerfanatismus' which they thought to detect, brought about in Montanist quarters.

A small detail calls for attention, viz. the use of ἐτελειώθη in the text quoted in the above. In the preceding paragraphs the deaths of Papyrus and Carpus are reported respectively with these formulae: παρέδωκεν τὴν ψυχὴν (37) and ἀπέδωκεν τὴν ψυχὴν (41). In the case of Agathonice, however, the similar expression ἀπέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα is amplified by ἐτελειώθη. Now Musurillo's rendering of this term with 'died' deprives the addition of any real sense; in itself this is rather unlikely, but there is another reason to criticize such a translation. The passive of τελειοῦν is regularly used to denote the death of a martyr, as can be ascertained from the lemma in Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, e.g. concerning Origenes' father: ὡς δὲ ἤδη αὐτῷ 6 πατὴρ μαρτυρίῳ τετελείωτο (Eusebius, *HE* VI 2.12). Elsewhere in a similar context μαρτυρίῳ is lacking.<sup>9</sup>

This use of τελειοῦσθαι to denote the fulfilment of martyrdom in death

is rooted right in the origins of Christianity, as can be illustrated by some texts in the New Testament. In Luke 13.32 Jesus, when warned that Herodes is aiming at his life, replies with these words: ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι. This is the only text in the New Testament, apart from Hebr. 2.10, 5.9 and 7.28, where the verb is used in the passive about Jesus. Its meaning is disputed: Plummer (ICC, ad *loc.*), Dilling (Kittel VIII 85, note 33) and Reiling-Swellengrebel (*A Translator's Handbook on Luke*, ad *loc.*) think there is no allusion to Jesus' death. On the other hand I. Howard Marshall in his recent commentary speaks about "the completion of his ministry in death" and M. Zerwick and M. Grosvenor in their *Analysis of the Greek New Testament* have the following note: "signifying his death and glorification".

St. Paul, speaking about himself in Phil. 3.12, has this to say: οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι. It is the only time he makes use of the verb in question.<sup>10</sup> M. R. Vincent (ICC, ad *loc.*) notes: "The perfection referred to is moral and spiritual perfection" and a similar explanation is put forward by other scholars. The analysis of V. Pfitzner, however, seems to be far more plausible: taking the context fully into account he draws the attention to the language used in verse 10: .....κοινωνίαν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. The apostle wants to reach the fulfilment of his life and his ministry by sharing in the passion and death of Christ." It would be carrying things too far, if the fully developed martyrological sense of the verb were considered to be already present in the isolated instances of the quoted sayings of Jesus and Paul. But it does not seem rash to regard these instances as preludes of a more systematical use of τελειοῦσθαι as a term exclusively reserved to the death of martyrs.

Martyrdom can thus be called a τελείωσις, as is proved by this passage in Clement, *Strom.* V 13.1: αὐτίκα τελειώσιν τὸ μαρτύριον καλοῦμεν οὐχ ὅτι τέλος τοῦ βίου ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔλαβεν ὡς οἱ λοιποί, ἀλλ' ὅτι τέλειον ἔργον ἀγάπης ἐνεδείξατο (255.1-3 Stahlin-Friichtel). The importance of this passage for our purpose does not lie in Clement's explanation, but rather in the implication that τελείωσις seems to have been a current definition of martyrdom: καλοῦμεν. In accordance with this Origenes in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom* warns his addressees against the Devil's attempts to lead them astray ἐπὶ τὰ ἐχθρὰ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ καὶ τῇ τελειότητι (p. 11.7-8 Koetschau) and bishop Dionysius of Alexandria uses the expression οἱ τέλειοι μάρτυρες (Eusebius, *HE* VII 22.4).

A full-scale examination of τελειοῦν and its cognate nouns in martyrological contexts would be desirable, but in anticipation of that it does not seem rash to conclude that in these contexts such words and expressions hint at the highest perfection which is possible for a true Christian, viz. the passion and death of martyrdom.<sup>12</sup>

An additional proof may be found in the Latin equivalent of the verb τελειοῦν. As can be gathered from the respective editions of Jillicher and Frede the translators of the *Vetus Latina* in both the New Testament texts quoted have chosen *perficere* or *consummare* to render τελειοῦν. When one consults the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, the last-mentioned verb in the passive is more than once used in the context of martyrdom.<sup>13</sup> A very clear instance is provided by a passage in Cyprian which is not mentioned in the *Thesaurus*: *sanguine autem suo baptizatos et passione sanctificatos consummari et diuinae pollicitationis gratiam consequi declarat in Euangelio idem Dominus* (Cyprianus, *Ep.* LXXIII 22.2).<sup>14</sup>

The importance of these reflections for the use of τελειοῦν in the passage quoted at the beginning of this notiuncula seems obvious: ἐτελειώθη by no means can be considered to be a mere ornamental addition without any special meaning. It rather seems that the author wants to emphasize that Agathonice's behaviour was not a rash suicidal act, highly condemnable because of the Church's rejection of self-sought martyrdom, but that in fact Agathonice's death meant the fulfilment of her life: therefore she ought to be regarded as a martyr in the fullest sense of that title; she belongs to the circle of 'official' martyrs: σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις.

*Passio Perpetuae* 5. The most pathetic figure in Perpetua's story undoubtedly is her father. He is utterly distressed at the revolutionary choice made by his favourite daughter,<sup>15</sup> who following Jesus' command in *Matth.* 10.37 (*Luke* 14.26) has withdrawn from the family ties and *thepatriapotestas*. During his first visit to the place where Perpetua is held under arrest this distress causes such a fit of rage that he even attacks his daughter physically. The second time, however, he has completely changed his policy, now pleading urgently with her not to continue her course which spells disaster for her relatives: himself he will lose his honour as a local man of standing and indeed the whole family may be brought to ruin.

In itself it is fully understandable that Vibius is doing his utmost to dissuade Perpetua and working upon her feelings for her parents and brothers and their interests seems a quite feasible strategy and it needs not to surprise the reader that such an urgent plea is made. The wording of the plea, however, is striking. In order to make this clear we first quote the relevant text according to van Beek's edition: (2) '*Miserere, filia, canis meis; miserere patri, si dignus sum a tepater vocari; si his te manibus ad hunc florem aetatis provexi, si te praeposui omnibus fratribus tuis: ne me dederis in dedecus hominum.*' (3) '*Aspice fratres tuos, aspice matrem tuam et materteram, aspice filium tuum, qui post te vivere non poterit.*' (4) '*Depone animos; ne universos nos extermines: nemo enim nostrum libere loquetur, si tu aliquid fueris passa.*' (5) '*Haec dicebat quasi pater pro sua pietate, basians mihi manus, et se ad pedes meos iactans et lacrimans me iam non filiam nominabat, sed dominam.*' The formulation of the first two paragraphs is most remarkable, as will be noted, when one compares it with the following quotations:

*Faune, precor, miserere* (Vergilius, *Aen.* XII 777)

*aut tu, magne pater diuum, miserere* (ib. IX 495)

Σμινθεῦ! εἴ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πτόνα μηρί' ἔκχηα ταύρων  
ἢ δ' αἰγῶν, τότε μοι χρῆνον ἐέλδωρ (Homerus, *Ilias* A 39-41)

*si bene quid genetrix, si quid uenatibus ipse promerui, ne, quaeso, sinas hoc omine Thebas ire* (Statius, *Thebais* VI 635-637)

*Iuppiter omnipotens, precibus si flecteris ullis, aspice nos, hoc tantum, et si pietate meremur, da deinde auxilium, pater* (Vergilius, *Aen.* II 689-691).

*diua potens nemorum .....aspice maesta agmina* (Statius, *Thebais* IV 747-754).

These texts can be found in G. Appel, *De Romanorumprecationibus* (Giessen 1909 = New York 1975), from which most useful survey many more instances with similar structure and style could be quoted. We add only one example, in which all the phrases relevant for a comparison with the text under discussion occur in combination:

*O di, si uestrum est misereri, aut si quibus umquam*

*extremam iam ipsa in morte tulistis opem,*

*me miserum aspice et, si uitam puriter egi,*

*eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi* (Catullus 76.17-20).<sup>16</sup>

The conclusion is obvious: Vibius in his appeal to his daughter employs the formulae which are usual in prayer. The anaphorae *miserere ... miserere, si ... si ... si ...*, and *aspice ... aspice ... aspice* emphasize this even further. Now prayers were often directed to the gods in situations of great danger, so that the prayer in fact amounted to an act

of supplication. Consequently, as Appel (o.c. 200) notes, *iterum iterum-que a scriptoribus humilis ac supplex inter preces describitur habitus*. This also happens in Vibius' case. He kisses his daughter's hand, an act which is not found in prayer but is typical for acts of supplication, as in Priam's supplication of Achilles." The posture as a suppliant also helps us to understand the astonishing expression used by the father at the end of his appeal: *me iam non filiam nominabat, sed dominam*. Musurillo's misleading translation presumably testifies to his embarrassment: "... he no longer addressed me as his daughter but as a woman".<sup>18</sup> It is true that the term *domina* can be used in addressing a near relative, a mother, a wife and also a daughter,<sup>19</sup> and a fine example is provided in ch. 4 of this *Passio*, where Perpetua is addressed by one of her brothers with *domina soror*. Such a sense is clearly out of the question in the passage we are discussing now. For in the first place Perpetua herself explicitly notes the contrast: no longer daughter but *domina*, and secondly the whole of the context, the wording of the prayer and the gestures of humiliation point to a different explanation. The 5th chapter of the lemma in the *Thesaurus (de deabus)* lists many instances of *domina* as the title of a goddess, which suits our passage much better. Self-humiliation and self-abasement is typical for supplication and supplicatory prayer.<sup>20</sup> By addressing his daughter as mistress, maybe even 'goddess' and prostrating himself Vibius stressed the distance between himself and his daughter, as any suppliant to the gods or men was wont to do. By using the solemn language of prayer and assuming the posture of a suppliant Vibius made a final, if unsuccessful effort to save his daughter, not refraining from an act of self-humiliation which he probably would not have considered under any other circumstances.

One can understand Vibius' efforts in bringing Perpetua back from her ruinous choice but it is truly astonishing that Perpetua in reporting her father's supplicatory prayer does not manifest any signs of embarrassment. She evidently is not troubled by her father's abasement nor does she exhibit any understanding of the problem he fears. She indeed pities him, but only *quod solus de passione mea gavisurus non esset de toto genere meo* (6), and next she comforts him by stating that she and her companions *non in nostra esse potestate constitutos, sed in Dei*. Perpetua thus founds her proud confidence on her belief in God's will, but her father, not without reason from his point of view, has this to say about that confidence: *depone animos*.



If read with its full implications, this 5th chapter is an eloquent testimony to the conflict which could rise within a family, when one of its members chose martyrdom as a God-willed destiny.

*Passio Perpetuae* 10. The *Passio* contains a number of visions which are made up of elements from art, ritual and earlier visions. In this chapter Perpetua dreamt that she had to fight with an Egyptian in the arena. We will not attempt to 'decipher' the whole code of this vision but focus our attention on the athletic fight and the date of its model.

The Egyptian nationality of Perpetua's opponent will not have come as a surprise to her readers. Lucianus and the inscriptions show that precisely the Egyptians were the athletes *par excellence* of the Roman Empire.<sup>21</sup> Now, athletes were usually supposed to be of handsome appearance. Pindar (*O.* 8.19) already pictures an Olympic wrestler as *καλὸς ἑσορᾶν*. Dio (*Or.* 28.2) praises the physical appearance of Iatrocles, the opponent of the boxer Melancomas, and Lucian (*Anacharsis* 12) lets Solon praise the beauty of the bodies of the athletes. To these examples, which we owe to an investigation by H. W. Pleket into the athletes' ideology,<sup>22</sup> we can add the description of the body of the martyr Pionius. After the martyr had died on the pyre, "those of us who were present saw his body like that of an athlete in full array at the height of his powers. His ears were not distorted; his hair lay in order on the surface of his head; and his beard was full as though with the first blossom of hair".<sup>23</sup> Considering this stress on the physical beauty of the athlete, it is rather striking that Perpetua described the Egyptian as *foedus specie*.

Doelger rightly concluded from this description that the Egyptian had negroid features.<sup>24</sup> Black Egyptians indeed already occur in Aeschylus' *Supplikes* (154, 719, 754),<sup>25</sup> and this particular colour of the skin evidently explains the name of a shady character in Isaeus 5.7, 40: *Μέλαις* 6 *Αἰγύπτιος*. As at the time the devil was already represented as black,<sup>26</sup> it is understandable that Perpetua recognised *non ad bestias, sed contra diabolum esse pugnaturam*.

What kind of athlete was the Egyptian? Louis Robert calls him "lutteur ou pancratiaste."<sup>27</sup> Both athletic contests are of course possible but the last possibility seems preferable. Just as Perpetua ascended to heaven only via a very dangerous ladder (*c.* 4), so she had to pass through the most dangerous athletic fight that the ancient world knew. From a psychological point of view the pancration also seems the most

likely contest, since we may seriously wonder whether this proud (see our comments on c. 5) young woman would have settled for anything but the most difficult trial. The comparison of the martyr's death with the pancration was not uncommon: Eusebius compared the martyr Porphyryus with a pancratiast.<sup>28</sup>

Perpetua's contest is presided over by a figure whom the Latin text calls *lanista*, which word Musurillo translates as 'athletic trainer', but the Greek βραβευτής shows that the agonothetes, the president of the games, is meant. Now Robert has very recently pointed out that the details given of the *lanista*—his tunic, shoes, dress, and prize — precisely fit the agonothetes of the Pythian games.<sup>29</sup> Originally these games were celebrated in Delphi but similar games, the so-called Isopythia, proliferated in Hellenistic times, and we know from inscriptions that these were also celebrated in Carthage.<sup>30</sup> Barnes has connected the existence of these Carthaginian Pythia with Tertullian's mention of *Carthagine* ... *donatam* Pythico agone (Scorpiace 6.2). In addition he reasoned that these games must have been a gift (*donatam*) from Septimius Severus, since we know that the emperor stayed in Africa between June 202 and May 204.<sup>31</sup> Against Barnes Robert (note 29) has argued that we cannot assume that every time an emperor visited a city he also must have instituted athletic games. This is undoubtedly true in general but seems too sceptical in our specific case: Tertullian's *donatam* points to a gift, and moreover it is unlikely that the emperor would not have visited Carthage during his African stay. As Tertullian clearly describes the Pythian games as recently instituted, the connection with Septimius' visit seems more than likely.

Tradition located Perpetua's death on March 7, 203. This means that the fight of her vision was modelled on an athletic contest which took place during the first celebration of the newly instituted Pythian games in Carthage, which at the time must have been the 'talk of the town'. As Septimius was still in Rome in June 202 these games probably took place in the winter of 202-203. Finally, since Tertullian refers to the games in his Scorpiace, we may at least pose the question whether he did not write his work immediately after the games' celebration and still before the death of Perpetua and her fellow martyrs. For, if he had composed Scorpiace shortly after their death, would he not have alluded to that event?

Passio Perpetuae 13.4. In his vision Saturus noticed that Perpetua

talked Greek with Optatus and Aspasius. As Greek was the official language of the clergy, this is hardly surprising. However, there is also another factor to be taken into account. Barnes has observed that a substantial part of the Carthaginian population habitually spoke Greek, and his observation is supported by an onomastic analysis of this *Passio*.<sup>32</sup> In a persuasive investigation the Swedish scholar A. Fridh has argued that Greek was Saturnus' mother tongue.<sup>33</sup> This was indeed to be expected on the basis of his name which is the Roman form of the Greek Satyros.<sup>34</sup> Fridh also pointed to the Greek name of Aspasius, and persuasively pleaded to keep the name Saturus in chapter 11, where this name has just as much manuscript support as the name Saturninus, which is accepted by van Beek and Musurillo.<sup>35</sup> The *varia lectio* apparently arose in order to avoid a second Saturus, but the name Saturninus too already occurs in the *Passio* (ch. 2), and the name Saturus was so popular in Africa that two bearers of the same name are not at all improbable.<sup>36</sup> Fridh even suggests that Saturus taught Perpetua Greek. This is not necessary, since the name of Perpetua's brother Deinocrates (ch. 7 and 8) already points to Greek influence in Perpetua's parental home, even though Perpetua normally will have spoken Latin. To Fridh's instances we probably have to add the case of Artaxias in ch. 11. He will have spoken Greek rather than Latin, since his name betrays an origin from Pontus or, more probably, Armenia, where various kings with the name Artaxias are testified."

In the second century Greek seems to have been a, if not the, current language in Carthage, although elsewhere in Africa its influence was declining. As Kotula has recently pointed out, the expression *utraque lingua eruditus* in second century inscriptions indicates that proficiency in Greek was diminishing.<sup>38</sup> This is also indicated by the wording—curiously overlooked by Kotula—of the accusation against Apuleius, mentioned in his *Apologia* 4: *accusamus apud te philosophum formosum et tam Graece quam Latine—pro nefas!—disertissimum*.

The *Passio* does not inform us about the social standing of these Greek speaking Christians. The fact that *Saturus* was a highly popular name for slaves suggests that we have to locate him and probably also the other bearers of Greek and Eastern names among the freedmen.<sup>39</sup> This is also suggested by the names *Optatus* (ch. 13) and *Reuocatus* (ch. 2). Syme has recently demonstrated that names taken from participles ending in *-atus* were preponderant in Africa, where they were typical for 'slaves, freedmen, soldiers'.<sup>40</sup> So both Greek and Latin names suggest a strong representation of freedmen in the early Carthaginian Church.

*Acta Maximiliani* 1. In our previous series of notes on page 52 we mentioned a certain neglect of the martyrological literature by the authors of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, (*PLRE*). In these *Acta* another instance can be found. Musurillo prints the date as follows: *Tusco et Anullino consulibus IV Idus Martii*, that is on the 12th of March 295. In his apparatus he notes that **Ruinart** had emended *Aquilino* of the codices into *Anulino*, but he rightly spells the name of the consul with double l, since that is the rule in other sources which mention **Anullinus**.<sup>41</sup> Curiously our passage has been overlooked by the *PLRE* s.v. *Anullinus* 3 and *Tusculus* 1.

*Acta Maximiliani* 3.3. An adequate edition of these *Acta* unfortunately is not available. In his fine monograph P. Siniscalco provides some information about the manuscripts and he announces a forthcoming critical edition by F. Dolbeau.<sup>42</sup> Up to now that intention has not been realized and the project even seems to have been abandoned.

The sentence we want to comment upon, is the following: *sic cum centenario numero te suscipiam, et simul cum domino gloriemur*. It is missing in one of the manuscripts (a 13th century codex in Dublin), but that manuscript lacks more passages, a fact which of course awaits examination by a future editor. Our purpose is only to elucidate the quoted sentence and especially the disputed expression *centenarius numerus*. Musurillo's translation runs as follows: "Then I shall receive you with my division of a hundred, and we shall glory with the Lord together". In a note he adds: "... as though he were serving as a **centurio** in heaven, though the text may be corrupt". This is a most curious explanation. *Centenarius*, as the lemma in the *Thesaurus* shows, is used in many contexts, and indeed also in the military sphere. But there is no example of the equivalence of *centenarius numerus* and *centuria*, which is implied in Musurillo's note.<sup>43</sup>

Obviously the solution should be sought in a different quarter. Siniscalco has drawn the attention to the fact that Christians regarded 100 as one of the perfect numbers;" e.g. Jerome, it is true in a wholly different context, speaks *de centenario numero qui plenus est atque perfectus* (Hieronymus, *Ep.* 121.6). The implication might be that Maximilian regards himself as the lost sheep which, after having been found, completes the perfect amount of 100.

It is, however, possible to improve on that explanation. Siniscalco touches on another sphere in which the number in question plays a large

part, viz. the interpretation of the parable of the sower. In early Christian exegesis the three yields mentioned in the parable (hundredfold, sixtyfold, thirtyfold) are held to be three gradations in the actualization of the Christian faith. A survey of the patristic interpretations can be found in the first 4 chapters of A. Quacquarelli, *Il triplice frutto della vita cristiana (Matteo XXII.8 nelle diverse interpretazioni)*, Rome 1953. From this survey it can be gathered that in the West in general two exegetical courses were taken. At first the hundredfold yield was thought to refer to the martyrs, the sixtyfold and the thirtyfold pointing to virgins and chaste widows respectively. Gradually, however, this view was superseded by one in which the virgins were held to be denoted by the first amount, the other two numbers being allotted to widows and married people living in continence. The first interpretation was still fully in force at the end of the third century, the time of Maximilian's martyrdom. Before we are in a position to suggest that in the sentence we are discussing this interpretation is hinted at, two closely connected questions have to be answered: 1. Is it linguistically possible that *centenarius numerus* denotes the number, the gathering or the group of those who have produced the hundredfold yield, i.e. who have suffered martyrdom?, 2. Could the term *centenarius* alone, without the other two numbers of the parable being mentioned, still refer to that parable and its exegesis? It seems that both questions can be answered in the affirmative by taking into account a passage in Jerome, who in a letter to Geruchia, subtitled *De monogamia*, writes about that pious person: *centenario uirginum choro cingitur* (Hieronymus, *Ep.* 123.1). Only some pages further down in the same letter, at the end of paragraph 8, he explicitly mentions the other two numbers, allotting 60 to the widows and 30 to married people. *Centenarius chorus*, which clearly means the chorus of those who have yielded hundredfold, viz. in this case *uirgines*,<sup>45</sup> is very similar to Maximilian's *centenarius numerus*. In his case, however, the earlier explanation of the parable of the sower is meant: *cum centenario numero* means "in company of all the martyrs".

Concerning the sentence as a whole our Nijmegen colleague Dr. A. A. R. Bastiaansen suggests this explanation. In the sentence immediately preceding Maximilian makes a request to his father Victor: *Da huic speculatori uestem meam nouam, quam mihi ad militiam praeparaueras*. Now *sic* in the phrase we have been commenting on is used in a formulaic sense (e.g. 'as I live') in combination with an imperative and the structure of the sentence can be compared to an oath

(like ita di me *ament*). This will be proposed in an Italian edition (with commentary) of a selection of Acta by Dr. Bastiaensen and other Dutch patristic scholars, which probably will be published in 1983. This explanation is undoubtedly correct. The clearest and shortest discussion of this linguistic phenomenon can be found in Fordyce's note ad Catullus 17.5, from which we quote the following: "sic anticipates the condition attached to the wish: the condition is expressed by the following imperative".<sup>46</sup> Fordyce also mentions some examples in which the imperative precedes the sic-formula, like the pattern of the sentence we are discussing.

If this explanation is right, one further step ought to be taken, viz. to take full account of the emphasis laid on the request expressed with the imperative. Maximilian's gift to the executioner is different from Cyprian's lordly gesture (*iussit suis ut eidem speculatori aureos uiginti quinque darent*, Acta Cypriani 5.4). The addition of the sic-sentence lends great urgency to the request. Presumably in this urgent appeal to do away with his military clothes Maximilian is asking his father to break altogether with the Roman army. In parting with the uniform which he had prepared for his son Victor will declare his solidarity with him. That in the end will lead to his own martyrdom, after which he will be received by his son amidst the centenarius *numerus* of the martyrs, so that together they can glory with the Lord.<sup>47</sup>

Passio *Iulii* veterani 1.1, 1.4 and 2.5. The date of the events narrated in this document is not stated explicitly. In the first words Julius' martyrdom is said to have taken place *tempore* persecutionis, a very vague expression indeed. The mentioning of the governor (*praeses*) Maximus is not very helpful either, no specific province being named. The title praeses does not provide a clue, as before Diocletian's new system, in which this title denoted the lowest grade of governor, the term was used in a very wide sense. As regards the name the PLRE s.v. Maximus 3-5 lists three praesides, all dated around 305 A.D. and all mentioned only in hagiographical literature. Besides the one of this Passio there is a praeses Maximus mentioned in the Passio Nicandri et Marciani (Ruinart<sup>2</sup>, 571-573) and in the Passio S. Quirini (Ruinart<sup>2</sup>, 497-500). Now various scholars have pointed out that the first two of these *Passiones* resemble each other closely in phraseology and therefore might well derive from the same martyrological workshop.<sup>48</sup> Although the third Passio does not resemble the other two in style, the similarity of

the name and date strongly suggests that the Passio *Quirini* was connected with the same workshop. The similarity in name, function and date of the three officials permits us to conclude that they are one and the same, if historically doubtful, person. This coincidence casts grave doubts on the historicity of the Passio Iulii, but in par. 2.5 there is an important, though small detail which suggests that at least this Passio contains a historical kernel. In his attempt to dissuade Julius from the disastrous course he has taken the praeses urges him to accept decennialum pecuniam. This detail looks authentic and therefore may help to determine the date of Julius' death. Musurillo renders the words quoted with "(you will pick up your) ten-year bonus", which translation at least is misleading. For nothing is known about any special premium for Roman soldiers after 10 years of faithful service. In fact the word decennalia refers to something wholly different, viz. the 10 year-jubilee of an emperor. At that solemn occasion vows were redeemed and fresh vows were taken, and the soldiers received a donatium.

In his survey Christians and the Roman Army (ANR W 23.1, p. 787) J. Helgeland reasons as follows: the decennalia of Diocletian and **Maximian** were celebrated in 294, but that was not a tempus persecutionis. So we have to move some 9 years further, to the decennalia of the Caesares Galerius and Constantine in 303. In such a way Helgeland indeed reaches the date which is usually accepted for this Passio, but his argument is not solid enough, for tempore persecutionis, as said before, is a vague expression, which does not explicitly refer to the Great Persecution.

Decennalia were celebrated by Septimius Severus in 203, Caracalla in 208, Alexander Severus in 230 and Gallienus in 262/3.<sup>49</sup> The first of these by no means is an unlikely date for our Passio, because, as W. H. C. Frend has made clear, the decade 196-206 obviously was a period in which Christians were persecuted vehemently and on a rather large scale. Possibly especially those who had recently been converted, were the target.<sup>50</sup> Now in par. 2.2 a phrase of Julius' is quoted which might imply a recent conversion: *putas* me, qui in prioribus (= his previous career as a soldier) *fidelis* fueram repertus, in melioribus infidelem posse inueniri? It may be objected that the praeses in par. 1.4 had spoken about the praecepta *regum*, qui iubent immolare diis, words which suit the Great Persecution much better. Although that must be admitted, this expression too is quite vague and, besides, there is at least the possibility that the imperial government of Septimius Severus indeed instigated the persecutions in the decade around 200.<sup>51</sup>

Concerning Gallienus it might be objected that his *decennalia* were celebrated after his tolerance edicts. But, as Frend has shown, the Christian soldier **Marinus** was executed in Caesarea after this change in imperial policy.<sup>52</sup> The plural *regum* in the phrase just quoted, however, does not suit Gallienus' reign, if indeed the formula has to be taken in its full literal sense and held to refer to specific edicts of reigning emperors.<sup>53</sup>

The same difficulty of course arises in the case of Alexander **Severus**. But here some curious facts deserve to be mentioned. *Acta Sanctorum* Tom. VI p. 654 on the basis of the martyrologies provides the date (27th of May) and the place (Durostorum in Moesia Inferior) of Julius' passion. Concerning the year a *non liquet* is presented: *tempus martyrii apud antiquos non exprimitur*. It is also stated, however, that the Church historian Baronius both in the *Martyrologium Romanum* and in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* ascribed Julius' martyrdom to the reign of Alexander **Severus**. The most recent fourth edition of the *Martyrologium Romanum* (Vatican City 1956) still has this ascription. The passage in Baronius' *Annales* referred to is the following: *Passus quoque reperitur temporibus Alexandri Iulius miles in Mysia sub Maximo Praeside ... Fortasse hic ille Maximus Pupienus, qui in illis regionibus aduersus Sarmatas pugnavit feliciter, ac postea factus est Imperator, qui et consulatum gessit anno sequenti* (C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* Tom. II, Antwerp 1597, p. 349). Baronius means M. Clodius Pupienus **Maximus** (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1179), in whose *Vita* V 9 a successful war against the Sarmatae is mentioned. It might be possible that these military activities took place during a governorship of Moesia Inferior. The objections against this identification are obvious: 1. Pupienus **Maximus** does not figure in the list of known governors of Moesia Inferior,<sup>54</sup> 2. Baronius lists Julius' *Passio* among the events of the year 228/229, whilst Alexander **Severus'** *decennalia* have to be dated in 230, 3. Pupienus **Maximus** was *consul ordinarius* in 234.<sup>55</sup> All the same it is a curious coincidence that the mentioning of the *decennalia*, to which Baronius does not pay any attention, in itself could fit in with a date during Alexander **Severus**.<sup>56</sup>

In any case the document as such does not possess any irrefutable proof of a date at the beginning of the fourth century.

*Martyrium Dasii* 2. On page 53 of our earlier paper we treated the phrase ὡς ῥόδον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, καθὼς λέλεχται, ἀνεβλάστησεν. We suggested



that this was a variation of Song of Songs 2.2: "as the lily among thorns", the lily having been substituted by the rose, because of the latter's connotation as a symbol of martyrdom. In a letter Professor Zeph Stewart has objected to our interpretation. He adduces Ammianus Marcellinus XVI 7.4: *sed inter uepres rosae nascuntur* and Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis* 2.1: *cum haberet parentes idolis deditos, rosa, ut dicitur, de spinis floruit*, the latter text specially providing a clear parallel.<sup>57</sup> A reference to *Canticum canticorum* seems out of the question. This critical remark has prompted us to add further arguments in an attempt to improve on the plausibility of our explanation.

Now in the first place neither De Jonge nor Bartelink in their respective commentaries on Ammianus and the *Vita Hilarionis* have been able to trace the origin of the expression and in the second of these instances it might very well have originated from the scriptural text, as we shall try to show. Further, although the words *ut dicitur* certainly point to a proverbial expression, καθὼς λέλεκται is a wholly different phrase.

A connection between *rosa inter spinas* and *Cant. cant.* 2.2 is suggested by C. Weyman in ALL 8 (1893) 409 (= R. Haussler, *Nachtrage zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwortliche Redensarten der Römer*, Darmstadt 1968, 79). The link between the rose as a symbol of martyrdom and *lilium inter spinas*, which we suggested in our earlier paper, can also be found in the 3rd paragraph of P. de Mora's *E rosa alphabetica seu ex arte sermocinandi*, a treatise which had escaped our attention: *prima rosa nascitur ex spinis persecutionis et haereticorum, dum in martyres insurgunt. Canticum: sicut lilium inter spinas, sic amica mea inter filias* (ap. J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense* vol. III, Paris 1855, 490).

The explanation of *Cant. cant.* 2.2 in such a sense is not surprising in view of the allegorical interpretations of this book, which was much loved by the Fathers. Origen e.g. said that the text referred to the *ecclesia gentium* amidst the unbelieving and the heretics (in *Cant. cant.* III, p. 178.20-179.1 Baehrens). But perhaps the closest parallel to the texts we are concerned with is the exegesis of Philo of Carpasia: ἵνα αὐτὴν εἴπη δικαίαν ἀναμέσον ἀδίκων, εὐσεβῇ κν μέσω ἀσεβῶν, ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ ἀναστρεφομένην, πρὸς ἣν φησι καὶ 6 Ἀπόστολος· ἵνα γένησθε τέκνα Θεοῦ ἀμώμητα κν μέσω γενεᾶς σχολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης (*Enarr. in Cant. cant.* XXXVI, PG 40 col. 60C).

These texts do not preclude the possibility of the existence of a popular saying concerning roses and thorns, which after all is quite

natural. But in that case the purport of such a saying will have been decisively changed both by a reference to *Cant. cant.* 2.2 and by the idea of the rose as a symbol of martyrdom.<sup>58</sup> For the author of the *Acta Dasii* the Biblical reference was still fully evident: καθὼς λέλεχται, but for Jerome the expression was already familiar.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> We thank the members of the *Genootschap voor oud-christelijkstudien* for their suggestions during the meeting of March 1982 in which we presented some of the notes published in this paper.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. P. Brunt, Marcus Aurelius and the Christians, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* I (Brussels 1979) 483-520, esp. 506f.

<sup>3</sup> T. D. Barnes, Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum, *JThS* 19 (1968) 509-531.

<sup>4</sup> P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1970) 257.

<sup>5</sup> The last four ethnics have recently reappeared in an inscription published and discussed by C. Habicht, New Evidence on the Province of Asia, *JRS* 65 (1975) 64-91.

<sup>6</sup> For this administration, see G. P. Burton, Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire, *JRS* 65 (1975) 92-106, who overlooked this passage.

<sup>7</sup> OGIS 517 = J. Keil/A. v. Premerstein, *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien* (Wien 1911) no. 116.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. H. Delehaye's cool judgement "Le fait ... ne semble pas suffisamment établi." (*Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité*, Brussels 1927, 168 note 5).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also Eusebius *HE* VI.5.1, VII.11.26 (with μαρτυρίω), VII.15.5 and 16.1; *Mart. Cononius* 1.1.

<sup>10</sup> In 2 *Cor.* 12.9 some manuscripts have τελειοῦται instead of the generally accepted τελεῖται.

<sup>11</sup> V. C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum vol. XVI (Leiden 1967) 139ff., esp. 145-148.

<sup>12</sup> A beautiful example is provided in the famous Lyonese letter. In spite of the horrible torments which they had so faithfully endured the prisoners strongly refused the title μάρτυς, which in their view was reserved only for those whose μαρτυρία Christ had sealed by their death. Therefore they urged the continuous prayers of their brethren πρὸς τὸ τελειωθῆναι αὐτούς (Eusebius *HE* V.2.3).

<sup>13</sup> In the lemma this is merely presented with these words: *passivum videtur habere moriendi vim* (*TLL* IV 599.56).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also *omnis consummatio et status uitae in martyro est collocatus* (Ps. Cypr. *De laude martyrii* 2).

<sup>15</sup> *te praeposui omnibus fratribus tuis* (5.2).

<sup>16</sup> Of course we are not concerned with Catullus' poetical purposes in *c.* 76; what matters is his use of *traditional* formulas.

<sup>17</sup> *Il.* XXIV.477ff.; see also Val. Flacc. 8.44; Luc. 2.114; Apul. *Apol.* 94 and *Met.* 4.26; Achilles Tat. 6.11.

<sup>18</sup> The same rendering is provided by G. Rauschen, BKV 14 (München 1913) 332: "... nicht mehr Tochter, sondern Frau" and M. Lefkowitz, *Heroines and Hysterics* (London

1981) 57: "no longer addressed me as daughter, but as woman"; C. Allegro, *Attidei Martiri I* (Rome 1974) 130/1: "non figlia ..., ma signora" is not satisfactory either.

<sup>19</sup> TLL V, s.v. *domina* ch. IV (*pro mero titulo et in honorifica allocutione et in epistulari inscriptione*). For a similar use of κύριος and κυρία cf. L. Robert, *Opera omnia III* 1607-1610.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J. Gould, Hiketeia, *JHS* 93 (1973, 74-103) 94f.; F. T. van Straten, Did the Greeks kneel before their Gods? *BABESCH* 39 (1974, 159-189) 183f.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. L. Robert, in *Entretiens Fondation Hardt XIV* (Geneva 1967) 236f. (with previous bibliography) and his *A travers l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1980) 429f.

<sup>22</sup> H. W. Pleket, Games, Prizes, Athletes and Ideology, *Arena* (the journal has been continued under the name *Stadion*) 1 (1975) 49-89.

<sup>23</sup> *Mart. Pionii* 22 (tr. Musurillo). We owe this reference to Dr. A. Hilhorst.

<sup>24</sup> F. J. Doelger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze* (München 1918) 52f.

<sup>25</sup> See H. F. Johansen/E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus, The Suppliants II* (Copenhagen 1980) 128 for more examples.

<sup>26</sup> Doelger (note 24), 49ff.; L. C. Ruggini, Il negro buono e il negro malvagio nel mondo classico, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell' antichità* (Milano 1979) 108-135.

<sup>27</sup> Robert (note 21), 1980, 430.

<sup>28</sup> Eusebius *M.P.* XI.19, cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (1946) 140f.

<sup>29</sup> L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) 468-469. For the prize of the apples, see also Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (1949) 93-104, 8 (1950 77-78 and 11-12 (1960) 363.

<sup>30</sup> *ILS* 5233: *Pythia Karthaginis*; *IGR* I, 802: Πύθια ἐν Καρθαγέννῃ.

<sup>31</sup> T. D. Barnes, Tertullian's Scorpiae, *JThS* 20 (1969) 105-132.

<sup>32</sup> T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford 1971) 67-69.

<sup>33</sup> A. Fridh, *Le problème de la passion des Saintes Perpetue et Félicité* (Goteborg 1968) 58f.

<sup>34</sup> For the name Saturus, see H. Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom I* (Helsinki 1971) 68-70.

<sup>35</sup> Fridh (note 33), 70-71.

<sup>36</sup> For the popularity of the name Saturus, see W. Thieling, *Der Hellenismus in Kleinafrika* (Leipzig 1911) 122.

<sup>37</sup> Wilcken, *RE* 2 (1896) 1326f.; R. Schmitt, Artaxerxes, Ardašīr und Verwandte, *Incontri Linguistici* 5 (1979) 61-72. We owe a copy of this article to the kindness of Professor Schmitt.

<sup>38</sup> T. Kotula, *Utraque lingua eruditi*. Une page relative a l'histoire de l'éducation dans l'Afrique Romain, in *Hommages a Marcel Renard II* (Brussels 1969) 386-392.

<sup>39</sup> For Satyrus as a typical slavenname, see M. Lamberz, *Die griechischen Sklavennamen* (Wien 1907=Separatabdruck aus dem LVII und LVIII. Jahresberichte des K.K. Staatsgymnasium im VIII. Bezirke Wiens) 29f., who ranges the name under the category "Götternamen als Sklavennamen" but realizes that the name characterizes "körperliche Unschönheit", a category which Lamberz wrongly does not distinguish in his material; neither does O. Masson, Les noms des esclaves dans la Grèce antique, in *Actes du colloque 1971 sur l'esclavage* (Paris 1973) 9-23.

<sup>40</sup> R. Syme, 'Donatus' and the Like, *Historia* 28 (1978) 588-603.

<sup>41</sup> It is therefore unfortunate that in his recent edition Siniscalco returns to Anulinus, even though this is the reading of the *codex Sarensis* which had escaped Ruinart. Cf. P. Siniscalco, *Massimiliano: un obiettore di coscienza del tardo impero* (Torino 1974) 8f.

<sup>42</sup> Siniscalco (note 41), 161ff.

<sup>43</sup> Besides, even if that would be possible, one does not understand why Maximilian has to be precisely a heavenly *centurio*. In that case one would rather be inclined to think that Maximilian, the prospective earthly recruit, is telling his father that he will soon receive him with his true companions, fellow-soldiers in the heavenly company.

<sup>44</sup> Siniscalco (note 41), 25.

<sup>45</sup> In his Bude-edition J. Labourt translates the quoted sentence as follows "... est encadrée d'un chœur d'une centaine de vierges". This translation does no justice to the parable of the sower, to the exegesis of which Jerome is obviously referring.

<sup>46</sup> C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus, A Commentary* (Oxford 1961) 141-142.

<sup>47</sup> Pending the publication of a new edition we hazard the question whether it might not be plausible to change *et* into *ut*.

<sup>48</sup> A. S. Mazochius, *In vetus marmoreum Sanctae Neapolitanae Ecclesiae kalendarium commentarius* II (Naples 1744) 653f.; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Scritti agiografici* II (Rome 1962) 90-92.

<sup>49</sup> H. Mattingly, The Imperial 'Vota', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 36 (1950) 155-195; P. Herz, *ANRW* 16.2 (1978) 1182 (Septimius Severus), 1184 note 350 (Caracalla).

<sup>50</sup> W. H. C. Frend, Open Questions concerning the Christians and the Roman Empire in the Age of the Severi, *JThS* 25 (1974) 333-351 = idem, *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries* (London 1976) Ch. V.

<sup>51</sup> W. H. C. Frend, A Severan Persecution? Evidence of the 'Historia Augusta', in *Forma Futuri, Studi in onore del cardinale Pellegrino* (Torino 1975) 470-480.

<sup>52</sup> W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford 1965) 428-429.

<sup>53</sup> The term *rex* of course is an indication that the text has been translated from the Greek.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. A. Stein, *Die Legaten von Moesien* (Budapest 1940); J. Fitz, *Die Laufbahn der Statthalter in der römischen Provinz Moesia Inferior* (Weimar 1966).

<sup>55</sup> A. Degraffi, *I fasti consolari dell' impero romano dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo* (Rome 1952) 65.

<sup>56</sup> Earlier martyrologies mention the *natale*, the place and *thepraeses* Maximus, but they refrain from mentioning a more specific date. The *revisores* of the *Martyrologium Romanum*, Baronius and his collaborators, have introduced the reign of Alexander Severus, an addition criticized by H. Delehaye: *quae tempore persecutionis acta fuisse caute scripserat Florus, ad tempora Alexandri imperatoris temere transtulerunt* (*Acta Sanctorum, Propyl. Dec.*, Brussels 1940, 212).

The ascription of Julius' martyrdom to the reign of Alexander cannot, however, have been the result of thoughtlessness. In a substantial note on the martyrdom of Martina on the 1st of January during the same reign Baronius renders an extensive account of the dating of this *passio* under Alexander, who, so he says, was known as a person sympathizing with Christianity (*ipsum fuisse Christianorum studiosissimum*). In his explanation Baronius *i.a.* refers to the law on foreign religions, which bound the Emperor as well, and to the activities of Ulpianus and Paulus (*Martyrologium Romanum auctore Caesare Baronio Sorano*, Antwerp 1589, 5-6).

<sup>57</sup> *Vita Hilarionis* 2.1 is also taken into account by W. Weber, Das Kronosfest in Durostorum, *ARW* 19 (1916/9) 316ff., to which Professor Stewart has kindly drawn our

attention. In note 1 op p. 317 Weber deals with the expression in the *Acta Dasii* which is discussed in the text.

<sup>58</sup> The ascetism of the 4th century anachorete is on a par with the martyrdom in earlier times.

3512 JK *Utrecht*, Trans 14